THE SHAKESPEARE ASSOCIATION BULLETIN

PAUL KAUFMAN, *Editor*

Contributing Editors

MRS. ROBERT CARLTON MORRIS ROBERT M. SMITH SAMUEL A. TANNENBAUM

Advisory Board

JOSEPH Q. ADAMS MYRA B. MARTIN
HARDIN CRAIG WILLIAM ALLAN NEILSON
EDWIN GREENLAW ASHLEY H. THORNDIKE

VOL. VI OCTOBER, 1931 No. 4

CONTENTS

When Burbage Played—in Colorado ..... *Frontispiece*
A True Shakespearean Critic—*Elmer Edgar Stoll* 135
Performances in the Elizabethan Manner—*George F. Reynolds* 145
Textual Difficulties in *The Tempest,* Old and New—*Samuel A. Tannenbaum* 148
Thunder in the Index, *Sonnets—Joseph Auslander* 161
"To You Who Read Our Secrets," *Poem—Isabel McKinney* 162
Sidelights on the Setting of *The Merchant of Venice—William Kittle* 163
Notes and Comment 175
Notes on Shakespeareana—*Robert M. Smith* 178
A Shakespeare "Spell-Down"—*Mrs. Robert Carlton Morris* 181
Reviews and Discussions 183

Published quarterly, in January, April, July, and October, by The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc., 15 Gramercy Park, New York.

Subscription rate, $1.00 per year, postpaid. Single copies, twenty-five cents.

Membership in the Association includes annual subscription.

All correspondence relating to the conduct of the BULLETIN should be addressed to the Editorial Office, Atlantic University, Virginia Beach, Va.

Other matters relating to the work of the Association should be referred to the Secretary Miss Myra B. Martin, 15 Gramercy Park, New York.

Copyright, 1931, by The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc.

Jessica in the Balcony Preparing to Elope.

Bassanio About to Challenge the Caskets.

When Burbage Played.

Models Devised at the University of Colorado.

A True Shakespeare Critic

By ELMER EDGAR STOLL

HAVING, I suppose, at some time or other—at some point or other—fallen foul of nearly every important Shakespeare critic from Maurice Morgann down, I esteem it not only a pleasure but a duty to pay tribute to the right critic when I find him. And I have found him, as no doubt many of my readers have done before me, in Mr. Granville-Barker. My homage, of course, he does not need. He was known long ago as an accomplished actor, producer, and playwright; and his two recent volumes of *Prefaces to Shakespeare* have, so far as I have noticed, already met with favor. All that there is, then, for me to do, is to give reasons for my own particular satisfaction.

Mr. Granville-Barker is the ideal Shakespeare critic, by both nature and experience. He is not merely a man of letters. A dramatist, a producer, an actor, he is also (though in much less measure) a student of the drama. Coleridge and Hazlitt, like most of the Shakespearean critics since, were literary critics alone. And at present we have for the most part what is not so good as that, scholars or philosophers who are not critics. Or else we have gifted critics and philosophers or psychologists, like Professor Bradley and Mr. Clutton Brock, who are not (to any considerable degree) students of the drama. But Mr. Granville-Barker both knows the actors' and the dramatist's art at the present, and (as no ordinary Ph.D. can contrive to do) understands how different that art must needs have been in Elizabethan times. And if he is also a philosopher or psychologist, he does not permit that side of his nature to get the upper hand.

He has, of course, much to say of the staging, costuming, and acting; but what interests me most is his treatment of the construction and the characters. As for the former, no one whom I have read has shown so sensible and intimate an appreciation of the way that Shakespeare went to work. Most discussions of Shakespeare's plots are nearly unreadable, and nearly worthless if read. They are couched in a jargon of manufactured phrases such as exciting-force or motive-force, crisis or turning-point, crisis-deed and crisis-emphasis, play and counter-play, force and counter-force; and the reason they are employed is that the devices thus denominated are supposed to be found in every drama.

The critic proceeds, on the whole, according to a formula. But as Mr. Granville-Barker says, Shakespeare did not so proceed, not even according to a formula of his own. With each new story that he undertook to treat he dealt freely, irresponsibly, and with an eye simply to the best effect. Often the very material dictated the treatment—now he followed the unities, now he didn't. There is indeed a general similarity of method in his plays, and particularly in the plays of one period; but for the most part this is owing to the fact that he was the same man, his audience the same audience. Tradition influenced him, but not consciously, strictly, and authoritatively, as it did Racine. There was nothing academic about him. His only concern was that his audience, which knew the current tradition as spectators, should understand him, and respond.

And it is so as critic that Mr. Granville-Barker approaches each play—as Shakespeare himself approached each old story he had chosen to dramatize. He enters into the author's problem as the author confronted Holinshed, Plutarch, or Boccaccio. He needs, then, none of this jargon, like Shakespeare himself. He is content without marking the crisis-deed or crisis-emphasis, and is consolable if he cannot find it. Since the names can hardly be used a second time, it is hardly worth while using them at all. Mr. Granville-Barker is light-armed, like his author. "Clarity of statement," he says, "a sense of proportion, of the value of contrast, justness of emphasis—in these lie the technique involved." And again: "Vivid contrast between scene and scene, swiftly succeeding each other—it is his chief technical resource."

This is what Shakespeare furnishes, this is what Mr. Granville-Barker finds. And so, scene by scene, in criticizing, he considers each addition, omission, or juxtaposition—the heightening and lowering of tone, the fashioning of the contour of mainplot or underplot and the inter-relation of both, as the author himself, more or less consciously, must have done in the writing. The matter is real, the art is alive. Illustration would take much time and space: it is sufficient to refer to the critic's treatment of the stories of *Antony and Cleopatra* and of *The Merchant of Venice* as examples.

What interests me still more is the critic's treatment of the speech and the verse. Here lie the characters, here lie (what is more) the substance and texture of the play. As he rightly says, at that time the art of acting itself was still dominantly the art of speech. On speech, not staging, action, or pantomime, the attention was centered. And though he does not waste his strength, as I

have all my life been doing, in denying psychologists and philosophers the right to go farther,—behind the returns, behind the scenes, so to speak,—and to draw inferences, it is, for the most part, in the characters' speech and rhythm that he himself finds their essential persons. The old story used is generally a traditional, improbable, though striking and dramatically remunerative one; and often in the action, consequently, the characters are not adequately revealed. Hamlet is fitted to the story, rather than the story to Hamlet, and the fit is not perfect or complete. So it is with Iago and Othello, with Lear and Cordelia, with Imogen, Iachimo, and Posthumus. Not by their fruits, not always even by their deeds, but by their thoughts and accents, we know them. *Hamlet* and *Macbeth* are not studies in pathology, in abnormal or criminal psychology, being Elizabethan stage-plays of blood and fate. And Mr. Granville-Barker does not, like Professor Bradley and Mr. Clutton Brock, penetrate beneath the "surface of the mind," to which Shakespeare as an Elizabethan (and indeed as a dramatist) rightly confined himself,—does not peer into the innermost shadowy arcana, lay his finger on lesions or turn the light on complexes. Or rather, he does not fondly fancy that he is doing this. And still less does he follow the lead of Continental scholarship, with its problems and enigmas,—dubious intentions in the poet or various hands in the play, even various voices in the character. He is like the poet and dramatist, intent upon poetry and drama. His eye and ear are his guide, as they cannot so surely be even to a poet like Chateaubriand, who, missing the Racinian psychology, finds Shakespeare's romantic maidens very much alike[1]; and still less surely can be to the Germans, who find Mercutio, Emilia, and Cleopatra on moral grounds inconsistent, and apply to character an elaborate apparatus and rigid analysis, somewhat similar to that which they have applied to plot.

What is more important still, Mr. Granville-Barker has a feeling not only for the individual voice or instrument but for the orchestration of the whole scene and play. Again and again he shows that "the effects must be valued very much as in music." An example is the scene of the successful choice in *The Merchant of Venice.* Here there are at the great moments—that of the choice itself, that of Portia's surrender, that of the news of Antonio's distress—crescendos of verbal music, each subsiding into the piano or pianissimo of a dialogue more matter-of-fact or intimate, with, near the end, "the austere prose of Antonio's letter chilling us into misgiving. And since—in

[1] Cf. my *Poets and Playwrights* (1930), p. 9.

stage-practice, and with the prevailing key of the play's writing to consider—this will not do for an actual finish, there is the last modulation into the brisk coda" of Bassanio the bridegroom's protestations of expedition and fidelity—

> No bed shall e'er be guilty of my stay,
> Nor rest be interposed 'twixt us twain.[2]

Scene after scene of such musical development and modulation will on reflection occur to the reader; for instance, the trial scene in this same play (though the critic does not speak of it), with Portia's mercy speech as the high and central passage, and (what some years ago I attempted to demonstrate) a far finer musical treatment in the finale of *Othello.*[3] In those cases it should be noticed that the drama does not flag—a more thoroughly musical and, indeed, lyrical method is to be found in the scenes amid the moonlight at Belmont or in the garden and the bridal-chamber of the Capulets. Nor does it flag in *Macbeth,* twice swelling and ebbing in the Banquet scene, and winding through the repetitions and variations of the words of prophecy in the dénouement.

The great and manifest advantage of such criticism is that we know where we are—with the poet, and in the Elizabethan Age. The senses, the eye and ear, are our guide, and not the prepossessions of our present-day art, the principles of our present-day science. Intuition rules us, not the intellect. We are in contact with art, not with real or unreal enigmas or problems, and are far from the hoarse and irrelevant disputes which these engender. We deal with form, with beauty; and with Shakespeare there is then little more room for speculation or argument than with Raphael or Michelangelo, Mozart or Beethoven. When we ask, and venture to answer, why this stroke or that? why this heightening or lowering of light or color? the question is apt, and the answer (if it respects the limitations of the art) will be just. It is only as we psychologize and philosophize that we wander far from the dramatist or (in judging him) from one another. The right criticism of a work of art is almost self-evident. As soon as it is uttered you half wonder that you had not uttered it yourself. Only in these evil days must plays have prefaces or prolegomena, and a novel like *Ulysses* be followed by a volume of interpretation, inspired by the author himself—for who else really understands?—but for all that not wholly acceptable to the critics. And while in one respect it is somewhat the same today

---

[2] Second Series, p. 78.

[3] *Othello* (1915), pp. 58-61.

with regard to the literature of a time gone-by, and we need by scholarship to be carried back to that time's traditions and *milieu,* or the author's methods elsewhere, the truth we are insisting on holds good. Criticism is a process of approach, not of departure; of interpretation, not of assimilation; and of eliciting—not imparting—a meaning. And here there is no more place for philosophy or psychology than before; once we rightly understand what the author is saying or intending, criticism is again a matter for the senses and for common-sense, for the intuition and imagination, not for ingenuity and argument. Indeed, it is somewhat so with *Ulysses* itself. What is really valuable in the book—and there is much—is, not the author's psychology and philosophy, his curious learning, his waywardness and mystery-mongering, his tricky ingenuity, in short, but what our eye and ear and simple wits can seize—the compass and structure of the story, and (somewhat again as in Shakespeare) the opulent speech and varied rhythm in which the characters are realized, by which they are differentiated. What in contemporary literature demands interpretation is scarcely worth interpretation.

Not that the esthetic critic, even a Mr. Granville-Barker, is like the pope on his throne; or that his utterances are dogmas. However gifted, a critic now and then falls into the personal estimate, as only others can see. As I cannot but think, Mr. Granville-Barker is strangely taken in by Shylock's oath and his horror of perjury, which is directly belied, according to Dr. Furness and the simple impression of us all, by his clutching at thrice the principal when the pound of flesh escapes him; just as is his money-lender's ruse of pretending to borrow the cash from "a friend" by his going home thereupon to "purse the ducats straight." (This trick both Sheridan and Scott took note of, or borrowed it from Molière instead, and handed it on to Little Moses and Isaac of York.)[4] Mr. Granville-Barker strangely speaks of "the betrayal of his faith," "his covenant with an unshakable God," just as he might of Milton after the Restoration. If nowhere else, the pretext or subterfuge appears in the very phrasing:

> An oath, an oath, I have an oath in heaven!
> Shall I lay perjury upon my soul?
> No, not for Venice.

The doge, I venture to think, would have hated to make the offer, down on

[4] *L'Avare,* II, i.

the table. For once Mr. Granville-Barker's ear fails him, or else, still more grievously, mine does me. That is not the way honest Englishmen, such as Shakespeare and his audience well knew, or honest Venetians such as Shakespeare imagined, would, at such a juncture, express themselves. Shylock protests too much, and there is an Oriental fulsomeness and flamboyance about him. Prophetic in the first line, cringing and insinuating in the second, heroic in the third, he is counterfeit and hypocritical all through. Here, if I am not mistaken, is a capital instance of the character lurking in the cast of the phrase and the turn of the line, rather than constituted in a psychology, the sum of the character's thoughts and deeds. And yet with the lines these are, as I take it, in harmony.

And sometimes, I think, the critic parts company with the scholar, as when he fails to recognize that in the matter of the wager in *Cymbeline* and in the matter of Iachimo's abrupt overtures to Imogen there is something medieval in the one case, something of the Renaissance and of ancient times in the other. (I am speaking of literature, of course, not the actual customs of the age.) These doings are not to be interpreted in terms of character, or of character as we know it today. If Posthumus did not enter into the monstrous proposal he would not be playing the game, would be showing the white feather.[5] And if Imogen did not believe Iachimo even to the point of losing faith in Posthumus, and then, when, having incensed her with his amazingly improper proposals, he withdrew both them and the slander, did not believe him again, and recover her faith, she would be upsetting not only the old story but also the dramatic method of the time. She believes Iachimo only as Othello did Iago, to the point of disbelieving his wife and his friend; and as Gloster did Edmund, to the point of disbelieving his good son Edgar; and again, and more exactly, as Macduff did Malcolm, both when he slanders himself and when he contradicts the slander; and even as Posthumus himself is presently to believe Iachimo—all without any internal reason for doing so. It is a convention such as underlies the story of Potiphar's wife, of Phaedra and Hippolytus, of Sthenoboea and Bellerophon: people in old story accept, without any natural inclination or psychological predisposition, what they are untruly but cunningly told. In hearkening they are not be be held credulous or suspicious. It is a device which expeditiously brings about a complication, a dramatically good and fruitful situation, with contrasts and ironies; and is like the playing of a

[5] Cf. Professor W. W. Lawrence's *Shakespeare's Problem Comedies*.

part by Hamlet, like disguise, deception, and mistaken identity in comedy after comedy, and like the Boccaccian substitutions in *All's Well* and *Measure for Measure.* Bertram is no fool, nor Angelo, either, and the stipulation of silence and darkness at the *rendez-vous* to make the fraud more credible, really makes it less. Time and occasion, the lack of acquaintance, on the one hand, the abundance of it on the other, all of which matters Shakespeare ordinarily respects, are here, for the purposes of situation-making, ignored.

In this regard Mr. Granville-Barker is not even consistent; for not only does he both here and elsewhere insist that we must accept the old story that Shakespeare has undertaken to treat, but before this, in the discussion of *King Lear,* he has said that Shakespeare "asks us to allow him the fact of the deception." So, surely, the dramatist does here again, with the momentary deception of Imogen and the more lasting deception of her lover in the sequel. And then, if, as the Elizabethans did, we comply, the character comes out right and clear. Imogen, like Gloster and Othello, is no longer at this juncture a "bit of a fool;" Iachimo, otherwise so subtle and dexterous, is, with his abrupt and premature proposals for conjugal revenge, no longer at this juncture "crassly blundering;" and Posthumus, in crediting his report of success, needs no longer to be supposed to be already harboring "the shadow of a doubt," nor is he at the outset (if the wager be taken for granted) to be called "a man out of his senses" for betting on his wife, like other gentlemen in medieval story, as on his horse or hound. Mr. Granville-Barker himself complains that Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch takes Bassanio for a tuft-hunter, which, however justified by the bare facts of the story, is, as he says, manifestly contrary to Shakespeare's intention.[6] Certainly these interpretations of the three characters in *Cymbeline* are equally contrary to his intention; and as a result they tax to a degree the critic's dialectical powers in exposition. With an Imogen a bit of a fool, he is, as well he might be, particularly uncomfortable; and if here we are to seek for the character not only in her speech but also further—within the old story—we must, I should think, do that when this now very questionable stranger, who has already made such lascivious proposals to her, asks her to receive a trunk of plate for safe-keeping. Why should a young

[6] Cf. Mr. John Bailey's recent little book on Shakespeare. It is a happy sign of the times that our Shakespeare critics are, both in principle and in practice, beginning to take the intention of the dramatist as their criterion, not their own impressions; and it is with notable result in Mr. Bailey's judgment upon Shylock, Richard II, and Falstaff. What we might have been saved if this simple matter of common sense had been recognized a half century ago!

lady receive even a quite irreproachable stranger's trunk full of valuables in her chamber? She is then, as the critic seems not to consider, a bigger fool than ever. If the Italian and his servants cannot for a single night fend for themselves, surely in the royal palace there are other places for safe-keeping than the princess's bed-chamber; and a slanderer and apparent woman-hunter, and his trunk above all, ought to be treated warily. It is hard to tell which is the more improper and improbable, the request or the granting of it. Any banker or hotel-keeper nowadays, even without an experience like hers the moment before, would require, and be offered, a view of the contents and an inventory, or else affix a seal. But as soon as Iachimo unsays what he has said, Imogen, like Macduff with Malcolm, believes him, and in him, as if he had never said it. And the impropriety, in any case or circumstances, simply does not occur to anybody on the stage, and (if we would apprehend the character aright) should not to us before it.

For in Shakespeare's text, in Shakespeare's intention, and (so far as we accept his conventions and simplifications) in Shakespeare's effect on the audience, these four improbabilities:—the wager; the slander of Posthumus to Imogen, proposal of revenge, and successful denial of both; the proposal to take the trunk into her bed-chamber; and the circumstantial slander of Imogen on his return;—all four, I say, hang or fall together. Why shouldn't Imogen believe Iachimo if Posthumus can make such a wager and give him a letter of introduction? If she can believe a man slandering her husband whom an hour before she had never seen, why shouldn't she believe him when he declares it was only an *essai de vertu* and praises him again? If she can then believe him anew, why shouldn't she frankly and trustfully receive his treasure into her chamber? And if Posthumus has been willing to let his belief in his wife hinge upon the evidence of conquest which he is to bring back with him, what more can he ask than the bracelet in the seducer's hand and the description of her chamber and her person upon his lips? But this structure of narrative, which holds together on the stage, fairly falls to pieces in the study—the grounds of this belief are mere fact and hearsay, not the knowledge of character, the consideration of motives and the rooted prejudices or prepossessions of affection; and to attempt to connect the action with a psychology is to trouble both. The reason that the action will not bear a rigorous examination, is that it has been conventionalized and simplified, in order that it may be condensed. As often in Shakespeare, there is too much story to be based solidly on reality: if, for instance, Iachimo had with Imogen taken the right

way of going about it—that of winning her affections—he would have required several meetings, the dramatist several scenes. All three characters, as we have seen, are in Mr. Granville-Barker's hands a little warped. A psychology is secured at a cost. The wit of the three is sacrificed, and the charm of the twain. Now this is contrary to the spirit of Shakespeare. Posthumus and Imogen, like Othello and Desdemona, are intended to keep our sympathy from beginning to end. In themselves they deserve it.

These, indeed, are points at which the trained ear and delicate intuition are by the critic forsaken (as sometimes in a measure they must be) for the guidance of the reason. But these are points, also, at which only historical considerations can set the reason straight, and thus, in consequence, restore imagination and intuition to their own. Yet in the case of an art that is antiquated mischances are likely to befall any of us, and Mr. Granville-Barker less often than most. How properly he interprets Cleopatra, trusting his ear and not his ingenuity, trusting his eye, so to speak, and not spying behind the canvas—in any case leaving unexplored, as the dramatist has done, the ultimate reasons why she fled from Actium, let Thyreus kiss her hand, and hid, and denied that she had hid, her treasure! He keeps instead to the glittering, iridescent surface of her mind, disclosed in her speech and rhythms, somewhat as we ourselves should have been fain to do had we known her. He considers not too curiously, not irrelevantly. He makes no show of peering, like the psychologists and philosophers, through mill-stones.

There is another slight shortcoming—in the presentation. The perfect critic of Shakespeare should, like Coleridge, Hazlitt, and Lamb, know how to write, and the author of the *Voysey Inheritance* certainly knows. As a critic, however, he does not always write so well as he can. Any one with perception reads him eagerly, but sometimes not easily, and I fear that the public in general will not read him at all. For some strange reason he has succumbed to a taste for parentheses, for long ones, too, and sometimes as many as two or three in a sentence. These are no doubt owing to the fulness of his vision, which embraces not only the thought but its counterpart, not only one side of a truth but the others. He bows under the burden of his thought. Yet this does not explain his strange method of introducing citations from the poet into his text. For the most part he treats them in a disturbing and distracting way, as substantives, without a preparative noun, such as "the phrase" or "the

expression," to bridge over the transition. For example: "But now it is

O, come, Ventidius
You must to Parthia,

while he will wait the chance to step back to his sty." That, because of the brevity of the citation, is comparatively easy; when it is a half-dozen lines in length you may have to re-read the whole. Particularly annoying is this habit when the excerpt is introduced by adjectival modifiers or a preposition. For example: "Then, with *a yet more categorical*

But I now
Profess myself etc., [*for five lines*]

Iachimo brings him to the direct grim challenge of

If you can mak't apparent
[*Six lines*]

and to make it, we note, Posthumus must needs," etc. And the strangest thing about it all is that an actor will thus write what can with difficulty be spoken.

These, however, are but specks upon the surface. No one now writes of Shakespeare so well as Mr. Granville-Barker or so much to the point. Many are writing, and abundantly. If amongst them there are now fewer gentlemen of rank or leisure, fewer retired members of the British and German bench and bar, and army and navy, their places are more than filled by the German and American Ph.D.'s. A key to *Hamlet* is continually found and offered anew, and the reader has generally got one already of his own. As the reviewer in the *Times Supplement* well observes, "it is pardonable to regard with caution [he might justly have said, "with suspicion"] every book and pamphlet that bears Shakespeare's name. What a blessing, then, a Shakespearean volume that bears also another name, which stands above the quibblers and the sycophants, and is itself a warrant of balanced knowledge and temperate enthusiasm!"

Performances in the Elizabethan Manner

By GEORGE F. REYNOLDS

NO matter how hard one tries to visualize the Elizabethan theatre or to imagine how plays were given on it, still it is likely to remain vague and indefinite unless one can get some sort of tangible enbodiment of it.

These models are the result of an attempt at such a realization.[1] The pictures are not to be taken too seriously. There is admittedly a striking likeness between, for instance, Bassanio and Malcolm, extending even to their costumes, but there may have been on the Globe stage, too.

More antiquarian details must be looked at also with quizzical skepticism. However, every detail even the most dubious, has some precise evidence in Elizabethan sources in its favor, more than can be said for some more seriously propounded suggestions in this field. The pictures are not intended to show what is sure or even what we would confidently urge as likely, but rather to try out what seems at least possible.

In general the pictures are intended to show how multiple settings, if used in Shakespeare's plays, may have appeared on the usually accepted form of Shakespeare's stage. The rush-strewn platform, the curtained rear stage, the side doors, the balcony, the orchestra at one side of it—all are customary enough in such restorations. One disputed point seems to receive some light as soon as one works with such a model, the elevated rear stage. Elizabethan plays offer little evidence in favor of such elevation, but it at once shows up as offering great advantages. Of the several reconstructions these brief descriptions may be offered:

Macbeth (Act I, 6: "By your leave, hostess"). Lady Macbeth welcomes Duncan to the castle. This picture is included to show how well the rear stage could simulate a castle gate-way, provided the curtain and arras (I must interpolate that I think they were sometimes different, the arras being on occasion the hangings of the rear stage) were shoved out of sight. One could wish the

---

[1] Herbert Nelson, now a member of the department of English in the State College at Corvallis, Washington, made the stage model and "cut-outs" while he was a student at the University of Colorado, and together we posed the scenes.—Professor Reynolds generously sent photographs of fourteen models. We only wish that all of them might be reproduced here.—EDITOR.

construction of the figures allowed them to manifest a greater interest at this point in matters on the stage rather than in the audience.

Macbeth (Act II, 3). The Porter has just let in Macduff and Lennox, and since the arras is now in view, even those so ignorant as to miss the point of the knocking and of the unlocking of the gate, must be aware that the scene is within and not without the castle.

Bassanio Chooses.

The models for *The Merchant of Venice* may be called attention to more briefly. They show a similar use of sceneboards and a different employment of the settings. Since the throne would be used only in the trial scene (for the Duke) and the trees fit only into the garden scene, the stage may be free from them most of the time. The first model shows Jessica in the balcony preparing to elope (Act II, 6); in 2 Bassanio is about to challenge the caskets (Act III, 2, 39), and in 3 (Act III, 2, 107) he has made his choice. (See frontispiece for illustration.)

We have planned sometime or other to "produce" other plays in this manner, but these are perhaps enough to show the interest of such attempts. The results are, of course, uncertain, but perhaps no more so than some more learnedly advocated opinions.

Macbeth, I, 6.—"By your leave, hostess."

Macbeth, II, 3.—Porter scene.

The Colorado Models.

Textual Difficulties in *The Tempest:* Old and New

By SAMUEL A. TANNENBAUM

NO branch of Shaksperian criticism gets less attention and commands less respect than that which attempts to rectify passages generally considered corrupt and to emend others which happen not to satisfy the tastes of particular individuals. The reason for this attitude is mainly, no doubt, a scepticism as to any modern scholar's ability to solve difficulties which have defied the learning and acumen of such giants as Rowe, Pope, Theobald, Hanmer, Capell, Malone, Steevens, Collier, Dyce, White, Hudson, and Furness. Passages which have proved generally acceptable, even though not unexceptionable, are regarded as good enough to be left "uncorrected." The would-be emendator is therefore often persuaded to remain silent, even against his better judgment. Notwithstanding all this, and even at the risk of being reminded of Mr. Aldis Wright's dictum that "in most cases ignorance and conceit are the fruitful parents of conjectural emendation," I shall attempt in the ensuing pages to solve some textual difficulties in *The Tempest.*

I. i, 44.[1]—The despairing Boatswain gives the order to "bring her [the vessel] to Try with Maine-course." Although in this sentence the word "with," without the definite article after it, is not idiomatic English, only Heath and White have departed from it, the former to "with the" and the latter—more appropriately—to "wi'th' ". Elizabethans, including Shakspere, often wrote "wi'th' " or "with' " for "with the". See, for example, line 74 of this very scene ("Let's all sink with' King").

I. i, 64.—"I'am out of patience." In most modern editions we find Sebastian saying "I am out of patience," even though that spoils Shakspere's metre. But the apostrophe after "I" in the Folio furnishes indisputable proof that Shakspere intended the two words "I am" to be contracted into one syllable ("I'm"). The surviving manuscripts of Elizabethan dramatists,—Heywood's *Calisto,* for example,—show that others besides Shakspere sometimes wrote out in full words which they intended to contract, and that they indicated this by the use of the apostrophe in one place or another. Ben Jonson's early

[1] My line numbering is, in most instances, that of the Furness Variorum; quoted texts are usually from the First Folio (Sidney Lee's facsimile).

Quartos furnish abundant proof of this. In *Measure for Measure* (III. i, 4) the First Folio has "I'haue" for "I've". Middleton, in *A Game at Chesse,* wrote "the' Assistant" (III. i, 159) for "th' assistant", "wee' are" for "we're" (IV. i, 12), etc. In the manuscript of *Thomas of Woodstock* we find (line 244) "we' had" for "we'd". And so forth.

I. i, 76-78.—Gonzalo, despairing of escaping shipwreck, says: "Now would I giue a thousand furlongs of Sea, for an Acre of barren ground: Long heath, Browne firrs, any thing". Clearly, Gonzalo means that almost anything terrestrial, even if it were only a single acre of barren ground, and even though it were entirely covered with "long heath, Browne firrs, any thing," would be preferable to the vast quantities of Sea stretching before him. The "long heath" and brown firrs" have perplexed the commentators. Hanmer's emendation—"ling, heath, broom, furze"—has commended itself to some of the best editors of this play. Others still read "long heath, brown firs" (or "brown furze"). "Brown firs" is pointless; "brown" does not suggest "barrenness" (which, under the circumstances, would not have mattered to Gonzalo, anyhow) or discomfort. "Long heath" we know to have been a specific wild plant and highly suggestive of barrenness. Furze is an evergreen and Shakspere would hardly have applied the adjective "brown" to it. "Broume," an Elizabethan spelling of "broom," could easily have been miswritten or misread as "broune" and interpreted by the compositor as "brown".[2] "Firrs" is good Elizabethan for our "furze." I should therefore read, "long heath, broom, furze—anything". Gonzalo is thinking only of a little strip of ground, no matter how barren, how unpromising to life.

I. ii. 8-10.—

"A braue vessell
(Who had no doubt some noble creature in her)
Dash'd all to peeces."

In "creature" we have an error for "creatures"—an *es:e error* (the reverse of the error in Juliet's "Runaways" for "Runawaye"). Miranda could not have been such a cynical, pessimistic product of her island education as to think that the "brave vessel" could have contained only one noble person. We must not forget that the "holy Gonzalo," not merely youthful Ferdinand, was also a passenger. So kindly disposed is Miranda to humanity that sub-

[2] It is interesting to note that in the manuscript of *The Marriage of Wit and Wisdom* (1570) the word "brown" is miswritten "broume" (page 13, line 21 of Mr. Halliwell's edition).

sequently, beholding good and ill together, she calls them all "goodly creatures."

I. ii, 35-38.—

> "I haue with such provision in mine Art
> So safely ordered, that there is no soule
> No not so much perdition as an hayre
> Betid to any creature in the vessell".

In line 35 I would much prefer "prevision" to "provision"; the words "So safely ordered" seem to make "provision" tame, prosaic, and tautologous; "prevision" adds dignity to Prospero; *e:o* and *o:e* errors are easy and common.

After line 36 there should be a dash; Prospero changes the structure of his sentence—a not uncommon trick of Shakspere's (as a means of getting naturalness in his dialogue). Miranda had expressed (line 11) concern for the "poore soules" who, she thought, had "perish'd". Prospero is not content to say "there is no soul lost;" nay, he says, not only is no soul lost, but there has not been so much perdition as an hair.

I. ii, 46.—

> "The very minute byds thee ope thine eare".

Here too we probably have an *es:e* error. Prospero asks Miranda to open her ears. The singular "ear" is appropriate only if the function of hearing is meant; but when the organ itself is meant the plural seems to be preferable. Shakspere seems to have observed this distinction.

I. ii, 69-72.—Prospero, setting his daughter's mind at rest as regards her paternity ("Sir, are not you my Father?"), says to her:

> "Thy Mother was a peece [*i. e.*, a model] of vertue, and
> She said thou wast my daughter; and thy father
> Was Duke of *Millaine*, and his onely heire,
> And Princesse; no worse Issued."

It is generally agreed that the last line cannot be right. Almost all editors reject "And" (the first word in line 72) in favor of "A"; some also insert "thou" before "his onely heire". But these changes do not get rid of the grammatical difficulties. Knight retained the Folio text but removed the

semicolon after "Princess". Some modern editors substitute "A" for "And," retain the semicolon after "princess," and introduce a dash after the word "heir"—a reading which must prove troublesome and unintelligible to a modern reader.

The simplest way out of the difficulty is to regard the "and" as the compositor's misreading of the author's "a," a not unlikely mistake in "secretary" script. (There is nothing to show that Shakspere began his lines with a capital letter.) As for the rest, a little "business" makes all clear. "Thy father," says Prospero, "Was Duke of Milàn; and his only heir [*looking at her benignantly and petting her cheek*] A Princesse—no worse issued." It is thus that Prospero announces to Miranda what he had hinted at earlier in the scene lines 22-23: "my daughter who Art ignorant of what thou art"). Miranda, thrilled at the thought of being a princess, exclaims, "O the heavens!" Then she goes on to say, "What foul play had we," etc. To put a comma after "heavens," as so many editors do, is to ruin the author's meaning and to deprive the succeeding speech of logical sequence.

I. ii, 79.—Miranda, hearing her father say they had been "blessedly holpe" to the island, exclaims, according to the Folio and modern editors, "O my heart bleedes." It must be noted that tender, gentle, sympathetic Miranda is full of *O*'s; she seems to use this exclamation more often than any other of Shakspere's women. But there is a difference between "O" and "Oh"; when the word is merely an exclamation (of surprise, wonder, etc.), as in "O the heavens!" (line 73), it is all right to print it "O," but when it is expressive of pity, as here, it should be printed "Oh," or "Oh!" In such a passage as this, "O" appears almost like the silly mannerism of a flippant girl. Correctly, therefore, does the Folio in I. ii, 7-8, read, "Oh! I haue suffered/ With those that I saw suffer." In modern printing such things ought to be carefully observed.

I. ii, 89-91.—

> "for the liberall Artes,
> Without a paralell; those being all my studie,
> The Gouernment I cast vpon my brother".

For "those" it seems to be better to read "these" (an *o:e* error). "Those" might be misinterpreted as referring to "The manage of my state" or to the

"signories". "Those" for "these," and the reverse, occurs several times in Shakspere.

I. ii, 91-93.—

> "The Gouernment I cast vpon my brother,
> And to my State grew stranger, being transported
> And rapt in secret studies".

For "stranger" read "strange". Shakspere seems, to the confusion of printers, to have been in the habit of ending his words with an upward and backward curl which was easily mistaken for the abbreviation *er.* In III. iii, 41, ("If I should say I saw such Islands") we have the opposite mistake ("Islands" for "Islanders"), the omission of *er.* As I pointed out some time ago, in printing *Hamlet* the compositor set up "a doubt" for "adoulter," thus creating the most discussed of Shaksperian cruxes. A similar error—"Tunner-dish" for "tun-dish"—occurs in some copies of the Folio in *Measure for Measure* (III. ii, 175). The Quartos of *King Lear* read "iustice" for "iusticer" in III. vi, 21.

I. ii, 117-121.—The passage which has baffled Shaksperian scholars probably even more than Ferdinand's "Most busy, lest" is the following:

> "Like one
> Who hauing into truth, by telling of it,
> Made such a synner of his memorie
> To credite his owne lie, he did beleeue
> He was indeed the Duke".

His wicked brother, says Prospero, with his lies deceived not only those about him but even himself. Now, one cannot make a sinner of his memory by telling the truth; besides, if Sebastian told the truth how could he "credit his owne lie"? It is evident, therefore, that Sebastian did not tell the truth, that, in fact, he lied. How can we make Prospero say this? Very simply, it seems to me. "Into" is, as some commentators think, a compositor's error for "vnto" (*u:i* errors are easy); "by telling" must therefore be an error for "by-telling," *i.e.,* not quite telling it, telling it incorrectly. This use of "by-telling," if that is what Shakspere wrote, is one of his once-used words (of which he has a great many). Compounds of "by" in this sense occur in the writings of Shakspere's contemporaries, and he seems to have adopted them about this time. In *Cymbeline,* I. vii, 130, ("then by peeping in an eye/ Base and illustrious as the smoakie light"), we should probably read "by-peeping" instead of "by peeping" or "lie peeping."

I. ii, 121.—

"He was indeed the Duke, out o'th' Substitution".

Dr. Furness calls the line a "malignant Alexandrine" and records three attempts at correcting it. Pope proposed to substitute "from" for "out o'th' "; Steevens omitted "indeed"; Walker proposed to omit "the". The obvious remedy is, of course, to read "out of the substitution"—giving such an Alexandrine as we have in fair abundance in this play. Sometimes Shakspere's pen was faster than his mind. If we must have a pentameter we may omit the word "out".

I. ii, 240.—

"My braue Spirit,
Who was so firme, so constant," etc.

An exclamation mark is surely needed after "Spirit" to express Prospero's appreciation of Ariel's services. This applies also to line 251 ("Why that's my spirit"). In Shakspere's text we often find commas where exclamation marks are required.

I. ii, 139.—

"As thou reportst thy selfe, was then her seruant".

This cacophonous line should surely be corrected to "As thou reports' thyself, was' then her servant". There is a considerable body of evidence to show that Shakspere was one of those Elizabethans who saw no impropriety in writing a long secretary *s* at the end of a word and whose long secretary *f, s, ft,* and *st* were often indistinguishable or distinguishable only with difficulty. That Shakspere had no scruples about making the second person singular of certain verbs, especially those ending in *a* and *t,* end with *s* instead of *st,* is proved by *Sonnet XIX* in which we have "thou fleets" rhyming with "sweets". For the sake of euphony Shakspere sometimes omitted other letters, especially to avoid *dst* and *tst* combinations, as in I. ii, 393 of this play ("Thou stroakst me, & made much of me"). In *Sonnets XLI* and *XCVI*—probably printed from Shakspere's own papers—we have "mighst" for "might'st"; in *Sonnet C* we have "preuenst" for "prevent'st". His contemporaries and immediate successors also did this. Thomas Randolph, for example, wrote "doubts" for "doubt'st," "mighst" for "might'st," etc. In a modern edition the omitted letter or letters may be indicated by an apostrophe.

I. ii, 322.—When Prospero upbraids Ariel for gently protesting at being put to "more toyle," he reminds him of how the foul witch Sycorax had treated him. In the course of this we are told that Ariel had been "too delicate" to act Sycorax's "earthy and abhord commands" and had refused to carry out "her grand hests". The word "grand" here strikes me as extremely objectionable; after "earthy" and "abhord" it can hardly mean "of the utmost importance," and it cannot possibly mean "noble," "magnificent," "inspiring". It must be an error. When we consider how easily a *u* could be mistaken for an *n* and an *e* for a *d*, we cannot resist the conviction that "grand" should be "graue" (*i.e.*, grave). "Grave hests" are hests whose consequences would be grave.

I. ii, 413-424.—The Folio gives this long speech to Miranda, but it should be assigned to Prospero. Its tone of censoriousness is unbecoming to such a gentle nature as Miranda's; Prospero would not have entrusted the education of such a monster to his young and inexperienced daughter; and Miranda cannot be supposed to know anything about Caliban's "vile race". And, furthermore, the language is typical of testy Prospero; his preceding speech (lines 405-409) he begins with "Thou most lying slaue," just as he begins this one with "Abhorred Slaue".

I. ii, 413-415.—

> "Abhorred Slaue,
> Which any print of goodnesse wilt not take,
> Being capable of all ill".

The word "print" in this passage is interpreted as meaning "impression," as if Caliban had been a sheet of paper in a printing press. But to me it seems not unlikely that Shakspere wrote "point" (which could be misread "print") and that he meant to contrast "any point of goodness" with "all ill". Emendation is, however, not absolutely necessary. But what sheet of paper is so constituted that, being capable of all ill, it will not take any print of goodness? Elsewhere too Shakspere's *o* has been mistaken for *r*. In *King Lear*, for example, we have "prize" instead of "poise," "crulentious" for "contentious," "for't" instead of "foot," "crying" for "coyning," etc.

I. ii, 422-424.—

> "therefore wast thou
> Deseruedly confin'd into this Rocke, who hadst
> Deseru'd more then a prison."

There is no excuse for retaining the incorrect and cacophonous "hadst" in this passage; it should be replaced by "hast". "Deservedly" should, as Dr.

Furness suggested, be omitted; it was probably retained in Shakspere's manuscript only because he forgot to delete it. "Deserv'd" should be transferred to the end of line 423 (Furness). Shakspere may have written "ha'est" (for "havest") which the compositor mistook for "hadst".

I. ii, 431.—

"If thou neglectst, or dost vnwillingly"

Surely "neglects' "—another long *s:st* error.

I. ii, 439.—

"So slaue, hence".

Prospero, threatening Caliban, sends him to fetch in fuel (line 429); Caliban, cringing and praying him not to torture him, slowly and reluctantly starts to go (line 435). Prospero, irritated by Caliban's manner, says, "Go, slave; hence!" A *G:S* error.

I. ii, 472-473.—At the approach of Ferdinand Prospero says to Miranda:

"The fringed Curtaines of thine eye aduance,
And say what thou see'st yond."

The singular "eye" has an almost comic effect, suggesting a monoculate monster. One eye has only one fringed curtain, not "Curtaines". If "eye" were used for "eyesight," as it often is, it would be inappropriate to associate it with raised curtains. When "eye" means "sight" it is proper to use the singular; but since that is not the case here, should we not read "eyes" and regard the original reading as an instance of an *es:e* error?

I. ii, 566-568.—Miranda, hearing her father denounce Ferdinand as a Caliban, says, "My affections/ Are, then, most humble," etc. But this is surely spoken *aside* and should be marked so. It is extremely unlikely that Miranda would tell her father she had fallen in love with the stranger. Besides, Prospero had just admonished her that "One word more/Shall make me chide thee".

II. i, 65-68.—"Our Garments," says Gonzalo, "being (as they were) drencht in the Sea, hold notwithstanding their freshnesse and glosses, being rather new dy'de then stain'd with salte water". In the word "glosses," a mistake for "glosse," we probably have another *e:es* error. From the word "freshnesse" we may infer that Shakspere sometimes added an *e* after final *ss*. A compositor might easily convert such an *e* into *es*.

II. i, 99.—Gonzalo's reference to Claribel's marriage at Tunis evokes the comment that she is the rarest Queen "that e'er came there". The Folio assigns

this comment to Antonio, but it seems preferable to transfer it to Adrian who had previously (lines 77-78) remarked that "*Tunis* was neuer grac'd before with such a Paragon to their Queene".

II. i, 197.—In reply to Gonzalo's request that Antonio and Sebastian 'laugh him asleep, for he is very heavy,' Antonio says "Go sleepe, and heare vs". The word "hear" has proved puzzling, and the attempts to justify it show how inappropriate it is. Should we not replace it by "bear" in the sense of "bear with"—thus: "Go sleep—and bear us"? It must be recalled that Antonio is not always rude to the loquacious old Councillor; only four lines before (line 193) he had said to him, apologetically, "Nay good my Lord, be not angry". In "heare" we have a *b*:*h* error.

II. i, 340-341.—Antonio and Sebastian are about to approach the sleeping group; Gonzalo awakes and shakes the King, saying: "Now, good Angels preserue the King". Whereupon Alonso, who has evidently slept more soundly than Gonzalo (the natural result of his greater depression), says drowsily: "Why how now ~~hoa~~: awake? Why are you drawn? Wherefore this ghastly looking?" The Folio's assignment of these speeches is perfectly correct and should not be disturbed. Alonso thought they had all been asleep.

II. i, 180.—Caliban promises Trinculo to get him "young Scamels from the Rocke". Much ink has been wasted in discussing what "Scamels" were; but it is now pretty well agreed that Shakspere meant either "staniels" or "sea-mells (*i.e.*, seamews, sea-gulls). We know that Shakspere had read and digested Strachey's and Jourdain's accounts of Bermuda and had drawn on them for some touches of local color. "Sea-mews" are mentioned in Strachey's *Letter;* "Sea-mells" has nowhere been found. There can therefore be but little doubt that Shakspere's word was "sea-mews" (or "seamews") and that the compositor misread the *e* for a *c* and the *w* for *ll*—both very easy mistakes—and that he set the word up as "scamels".[3]

III. i, 17.—What is generally regarded as the most puzzling passage in this play is the last line of Ferdinand's soliloquy at the opening of the third Act. The debasing task of piling up thousands of logs, he reflects, would be "as

[3] For evidence that *w* could easily be mistaken for *ll*, and *vice versa*, etc., see my book, *The Handwriting of the Renaissance*, published by The Columbia University Press, New York, 1930.

heavy as odious," if it were not for Miranda—thoughts of whom make his labours pleasures.

> "But these sweet thoughts, doe euen refresh my labours,
> Most busie lest, when I doe it."

Not less than fifty emendations, it may be conjectured, have been proposed to get rid of the difficulty inherent in the words "Most busie lest". Some cling desperately to the original text, modifying it only to the extent of substituting "least" for "lest" and putting the comma before it, instead of after it. But no one is really taken in by this, or by any one of the other emendations that has yet been suggested. And yet, strange to say, the passage is not really difficult when it is considered in the light of Elizabethan script and Shakspere's fairly obvious purpose. The words "busie lest" are, it seems to me, a misreading of "lustieest". Shakspere's *l* was mistaken by the compositor for a *b*, the secretary *st* for an *s*, and the first Roman *e* (which was probably separated from the *s* by a slight interval) for an *l*. No misreadings were easier in an Elizabethan manuscript. (See my book, previously referred to.) That Shakspere's *eest* was sometimes mistaken for *lest* is shown by the error of "easilest" for "easieest" in *Cymbeline* (IV. ii, 269—"what Coast thy sluggish care/ Might'st easilest harbour in"). From *The New English Dictionary* we know that the word "lusty" was used by Shakspere's contemporaries, and by writers long before him, in the sense of "cheerful," "merry," and "jocund". Shakspere himself so used it a number of times. Ferdinand is therefore only saying that the sweet thoughts of his "admired Miranda" refresh his labors, and he is most happy when discharging his unpleasant task.[4] He implies, too, that then he does his work lustily.

III. ii. 81.—"I did not giue the lie," says Trinculo, according to the First Folio. A few editors follow the Fourth Folio in reading "I did not give thee the lie". The omission of "thee" may be accounted for as follows: Shakspere may sometimes have written "the" for "thee," as so many others did, and the compositor, seeing two *the*'s together, decided to omit one. Or the omission may have been a slip on Shakspere's part.

III. ii, 102-103.—

> "He ha's braue Vtensils (for so he calles them)
> Which when he ha's a house, hee'l deck withall".

[4] Professor Leon Kellner, in his *Restoring Shakespeare*, page 71, quotes two examples of *l* mistaken for *e* in Shakspere. An instructive example occurs in Middleton's *A Game at Chesse* (IV. ii, 10): the author wrote "the pukingst Soule," but one of his transcribers copied it as "the pukelingst Soule". He was probably transcribing a copy which read "pukeingst".

There is no excuse whatever for a modern editor's not accepting Hanmer's substitution of "deck't" for "deck". Both sense and grammar require the slight change. In the secretary script a *t* could very easily be mistaken for a certain variety of *e*. The difficulty of distinguishing between *e* and *t* at times is illustrated by the error of "conserue" for "construe" in *Othello* (IV. i, 118), "safely" for "softly" in *Hamlet* (IV, iv, 8), and so forth.

III. iii, 5.—"My old bones akes," complains the weary Gonzalo. Almost all editors substitute the plural "ache" for the singular "akes". Dr. Furness defended the Folio reading in this and in other such passages on the theory that Elizabethan ears were less sensitive than ours to the distinction between singular and plural, or that the mistake (if a mistake it be) represents the language of the compositor. To me it seems more likely that the grammatical incongruence is due to a confusion between Roman *e* and the secretary *es* symbol.

III. i, 82.—Miranda, drinking the sweet poison of Ferdinand's adoration, artlessly asks him, "Do you loue me?" Thereupon the rapturous lover replies, "O heauen; O earth, beare witness to this sound," etc. "O heauen; O earth" is so stilted, so unlike what a romantic young man would say under the circumstances, that I wish we could read, "*Oh!*—Heaven *and* earth, bear witness to this sound," etc. A certain sign of "&" might easily be mistaken for "O"

III. iii, 115.—In Prospero's undramatic and prosaic—and even clumsy—speech (lines 107-117) there occur the words "And in these fits, I leaue them, while I visit/ Young *Ferdinand*". "I leave" seems utterly contrary to the spirit of our English speech; the present tense here would indicate repeated action, something Prospero had done previously. But we know this not to have been the case; the context calls for "I'll leave them".

III. iii, 122-125.—The guilty Alonso, his conscience pricked to the quick, wails

> "the Thunder
> (That deepe and dreadful Organ-Pipe) pronounc'd
> The name of *Prosper:* it did base my Trespasse,
> Therefore my Sonne i'th Ooze is bedded".

In line 125 we must read "Therefor" (*i.e.*, for this trespass), not "Therefore" (*i.e.*, for this reason). Nothing is gained, and something is lost, by retaining the obsolete "Therefore".

IV. i, 7-9.—

> "All thy vexations
> Were but my trials of thy loue, and thou
> Hast strangely stood the test".

Prospero does not mean to say that Ferdinand had stood the test in a strange manner, but that, strange to say, he had stood the test well. To make this clear we should read "Hast—strangely—stood the test". There is no need to alter the word to "strongly" or "strangly". "Stood" is emphatic.

IV. i, 66-67.—

"Now come my *Ariell*, bring a Corolary,
Rather then want a Spirit; appear, & pertly".

These lines are spoken *aside* and should be marked so. They are not intended for Ferdinand's ears.

IV. i, 174-175.—

"the great Globe it selfe,
Yea, all which it inherit, shall dissolue".

Read "inherits,"—another *es:e* error. The globe and all that is on it shall cease to be. The compositor probably mistook Shakspere's final *es* symbol for an *e* and omitted it.

IV. i, 207-208.—

"the fowle Lake
Ore-stunck their feet".

Hypersensitive critics have suggested purifying this "disgusting utterance" (R. Bridges) by substituting "O'erswayed" for "Ore-stunck," or "fear" or "feat" or "sweat" for "feet". Jacobean audiences were accustomed to references to bromidrosis. In Middleton's *A Trick to Catch the Old One* (III. iv) foul-smelling feet are spoken of by Audrey. We may also recall what Frescoe has to say on this subject in *The Atheist's Tragedy* (II. v, 126-129). The subject is again referred to in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* (II. iii, 30). Shakspere's text here does not call for correction.

IV. i, 233-234.—Caliban admonishes his accomplices, "therefore speake softly,/ All's husht as midnight yet". In "husht" we may have another *e:t* error. Shakspere would probably have preferred "hush" to the obsolescent "husht"; in *Hamlet* we have "hush as death". See "hush" in *The New English Dictonary.*

V. i, 70-72.—

"A solemne Ayre, and the best comforter,
To an vnsettled fancie, Cure thy braines
(Now vselesse) boile within thy skull".

These words, addressed to Alonso, have proved very puzzling, and a number

of unsatisfactory emendations have been proposed. To me it seems "as plain as the nose on one's face" that we must read

> A solemn air, and the best comforter
> To an unsettled fancy, cure thy brains
> Now useless toil'd within thy skull".

'Thy brains which are now uselessly toiling within thy skull'. Parentheses are frequently closed in the wrong place in the Folio and in old manuscripts; *b* for *t* is an easy misreading in the secretary script. That the meaning here given is the correct one is proved by Prospero's subsequent comment: "Their understanding/ Begins to swell, and the approaching tide/ Will shortly fill the reasonable shore/ That now lies foul and muddy".

V. i, 79.—In the line "Begin to chace the ignorant fumes that mantle" the word "ignorant" is, as often in Shakspere, dissyllabic and should be pronounced "ing'rant".

V. i, 89.—"Whose inward pinches therefore are most strong". Another instance (*cf.* note on III. iii, 125) in which we should drop the final *e* in "therefore".

V. i, 94-95.—"Not one of them," says Prospero, "That yet [*i.e.*, now] lookes on me, or would know me". "Or" for "er" is such an easy misreading that I would prefer to read "e'er" (sometimes written "er" in the Elizabethan period). Collier and Keightley have also suggested this change.

V. i, 143-146.—

> "Welcome, my friends all,
> But you, my brace of Lords, were I so minded
> I heere could pluke his Highnesse frowne vpon you
> And iustifie you Traitors".

Prospero would not have included the villains Sebastian and Antonio among his friends. I would therefore read, "Welcome, my friends—[*aside to Seb. and Ant.*] all/ But you. My brace of lords," etc. A few lines lower down Prospero tells Sebastian that to call him "brother" woud infect his mouth.

III. ii, 129.—"Flout 'em, and cout 'em: and skowt 'em, and flout 'em."

All editors since Rowe, with the exception of Mr. Wilson, have substituted "scout" for "cout" in Caliban's song. The *"new" Cambridge* editor retains "cout" on the theory that it is a variant of "colt" and means "befool". "Cout," as a variant of "colt," does not occur until the nineteenth century (*cf., N.E.D.*). Much more serious and convincing objections to the retention of "cout" are given by Mr. Mark Hunter in a communication to the *Review of English Studies,* volume 2, pages 347-348, July 1926.

Thunder in the Index*

By JOSEPH AUSLANDER

I

With thunder in the index I salute,
With thunder stolen from the bravest thief
That ever plucked the fabulous golden fruit
Or ever gilded the familiar leaf.
They called you "upstart crow" and other names,
Accused your feathers, lunged against your pride:
But look, the Stallion's garnet nostril flames!
He storms the stars in one swift silver stride!
Still under apple trees the drowsy dragons
Roll a red eye and snort around the trees;
And still the starry felon loads his wagons
With yellow loot from the Hesperides . . .
We have not altered, save in time and place:
We always find a woman in the case.

II

Yet though the general appetite prefer
Wenches with dazzling locks, God save the mark!
Still there are some, a trifle stodgier
Perhaps, who love the ladies that are dark.
And though occasional parallelograms
Add spice and angles to the rule of three,
Our handsome friends come in like April lambs
And leave us poorer by geometry.
But if they furnish us with sonnet-stuff,
We can at least forgive each gay absconder,
Who know how he will weary soon enough,
How absence in the spring makes her heart fonder—
That is, if we boast lungs above our fellows
To stretch ten octaves where our neighbour bellows!

* These three sonnets constitute Mr. Auslander's introduction to an edition of *Shakespeare's Sonnets* published by Cheshire House, New York. They are reproduced here with the consent both of the author and the publisher. To both our thanks.

III

Ah Time, that leavest even the loveliest head
At length the target to thy frosts and snows!
However she sang sweet, went garlanded
With songs, the songs remain, the singer goes.
But thou shalt blunt thy tusk upon a phrase!
The poet with a song between his teeth
Like a red rose shall flaunt thee to thy face
And hurl thee in confusion to thy death!
This lord of music that unlocked his heart
In sonnets, this robust and personal spirit
From human anguish coaxed such heavenly art,
Seduced the soul to paradise—or near it,
And came to grips with Death and closed with Time
On the pale ladder of one immortal rhyme!

"To You Who Read Our Secrets"

By ISABEL McKINNEY

To you, who read our secrets in our eyes,
Who moulded Imogen and Isabel,
Who made the laughing Rosalind so wise,
And caged in Goneril the fires of hell;
To you, who loved in lovely Juliet
And white Miranda on her virgin isle,
Knowing the lightning flame, the glorious threat,
Of darkling Cleopatra, all the while;
Who suffered from Othello's smoking heart
And rage of ownership; who turned away
In anguish with Cordelia; or played a part
With Portia, glowing for her marriage day!
All women of all ages, lands, and rôles,
Hail you, the first explorer of our souls.

Sidelights on the Setting of *The Merchant of Venice*

By WILLIAM KITTLE

THE following statement of the remarkable number of the time, place, and descriptive phrases in this colorful drama is submitted for possible interpretation, but not of course, as scientific proof that Shakespeare had definitely in mind the three illustrious and allied feudal families, with Belmont as the original Castle of the far-famed House of Este. That the great dramatist had in mind some idealized and most fitting background for his creations of Portia and Belmont would seem to appear from his lines in the play, but the text itself does not prove a prototype nor a definite location for either. However, interesting evidence can be adduced.

The Merchant of Venice is a mosaic of seven elements:—

Venice:

> There, where your argosies with portly sail,
> Like signiors and rich burghers on the flood,
> Or, as it were, the pageants of the sea,
> Do overpeer the petty traffickers. (I, iii.)

Its scarlet-robed "Magnificoes" appear, and Portia sets forth the inflexibility of Venetian law:

> It must not be; there is no power in Venice
> Can alter a decree established:
> 'Twill be recorded for a precedent,
> And many an error, by the same example,
> Will rush into the state: it cannot be. (IV, i.)

Padua:

The learning of its University, and its connection with the Doge and Senate of Venice; a striking historic example is reproduced in the play.

Belmont:

Shakespeare locates eight scenes of the play at Belmont, including all of Act V and no fewer than ten time, place, and descriptive phrases, each having a bearing on its location.

The Story of the Caskets:

This was derived from Italian literature (The *Gesta Romanorum* of the

13th century), a collection of stories, translated into English about 1510, and reprinted in English six times between 1577 and 1601.

The Story of the Bond:

This also came from Italian literature (*Il Pecorone,* compiled about 1378 by Giovanni Fiorentino), a collection of stories, first published in English in 1565.

The Story of Lorenzo and Jessica with no known prototype in literature.

The Story of the Rings: In *Il Pecorone.*

Three Great Feudal Houses of the Renaissance

1. The Este Family (917 to 1597):

For almost seven centuries, the House of Este, antedating the most aristocratic families of all Italy,—the Orsini, the Colonna, the Montefeltro of Urbino, the Gonzaga of Mantua, the Sforza of Milan, and the Medici of Florence, held the primacy of ancient lineage, and rivalled the splendor of the Court and culture at Urbino.

"La Casa d'Este was of immemorial antiquity. Around its unknown origin medieval chroniclers wove their flattering tales of Trojan ancestors and Roman heroes whom they name 'Atii' from Ateste, the Roman appellation of the ancient town of Este. The scholars that thronged the Court of Ferrara in the 15th and 16th centuries vied in embellishing these legends with fantastic details. . . . The name of Este is surrounded by a glamour of romance and poetry." (*The story of Ferrara,* Ella Noyes, 1904.)

From Adalbert d' Este, who died about 917, to Azzo VI, Marquis of Este, who became ruler of Ferrara in 1208, a period of about 300 years, this family had their court at Este, 20 miles southwest of Padua and 45 miles southwest of Venice. But, yet, 300 years later, in 1508-1559, Ercole II d' Este of Ferrara, and his brother Cardinal Ippolito d' Este the Younger, both patrons of art and literature, built the splendid Castle of Este, whose massive walls, broad entrance avenue and terraces still arouse the wonder and admiration of tourists at its beautiful location on that south slope of the Euganean hills.

Nicholas III d' Este (1384-1441) ruled Ferrara, Modena, Parma and Reggio; his son, Leonello (died 1450), extended the scope of the University of Ferrara to which great numbers of students and scholars came from all parts of Italy, and from Germany, France and England; he collected books, MSS, medals, artistic furniture, jewels and art metal works.

"To Ercole I d' Este (1431-1505) the Drama owes much." He collected Greek and Latin MSS, was a patron of art and literature and loved the theatre. His daughter, Isabella d' Este (1474-1539), married Francesco Gonzaga, Marquis of Mantua in 1490. She was, par excellence, the most famous lady of all the Italian Renaissance. Her sister, Beatrice d' Este, married (1491) the lord of Milan, Lodovico Sforza (*Il Moro,* the Moor).

Ercole II d' Este (1508-1559) married Renee, the daughter of Louis XII, King of France, and their daughter Renee married the Duke of Urbino.

Alfonso II d' Este (1533-1597), the last of the male line, and living at the time when Shakespeare wrote *The Merchant of Venice,* "was passionately fond of music, for which the court was renowned. There were dancing, entertainment and interminable jousts. . . . He was especially devoted to the chase and had on his estate great preserves where he could indulge in his favorite sport. Such a place was La Mesola, near the sea, where he constructed an immense palace. A contemporary says: 'The walls around the villa were nine miles in circuit, with towers a mile apart, and four gates opposite each other, and a large palace with four towers. Between these walls was a dense forest full of a great quantity of wild animals, as stags, deer, wild goats, boars, etc., reared there, for the Duke's pleasure.'" (*The Sixteenth Century,* T. F. Crane, 1920.)

In the 12th century, Beatrix d' Este married Andrew, second King of Hungary, and on his death she married another King of that country. The Dukes of Bavaria, and the Dukes of Brunswick and Lunenburgh of Germany were directly descended from members of the Este Family, and as late as the 18th century, Mary Beatrice d' Este (1658-1718) was Queen of England, wife of James II; her portrait now hangs in the National Portrait Gallery in London.

Intermarriage of the
Este Family with the Gonzaga Family of Mantua.

In 1435, Lionello d' Este married Margharita Gonzaga.

In 1439, Lucia d' Este married Carlo, son of the Marquis of Gonzaga.
In 1490, Isabella d' Este married Francesco Gonzaga.
Later, Niccolo d' Este married Beatrice Gonzaga.
In 1578; Alfonso II, Duke of Este, married Margharita Gonzaga.

In 1480 Federigo Gonzaga of Mantua entertained the Duke and Duchess of Ferrara, at Mantua, and proposed the engagement of his son, Francesco, to Isabella d' Este, the engagement being celebrated with pomp in 1581. On Feb. 15, 1490, Isabella, escorted by her father Ercole I, her mother Lenora of Aragon, her brother Alfonso, and a train of nobles of Ferrara, arrived in Mantua for the marriage. Seventeen thousand persons went to Mantua to witness the pageant of the wedding, followed by a three days' tournament. (*The Gonzaga,* Selwyn Brinton, 1927.)

A Francesco d' Este was made a Cardinal by the Pope, and later, Ippolito d' Este was created a Cardinal and he with his brother Ercole II d' Este (1508-1559) built the Castle of Este, half way between Ferrara and Mantua, some 50 years before Shakespeare wrote *The Merchant of Venice.*

Ercole Gonzaga (died 1563), son of Isabella d' Este, was made a Cardinal by the Pope.

The House of Mountferrato.

In the 12th century, a Count Mountferrato held his title to the territory south of the Po River and east of Turin and this family was then "one of the most considerable in Lombardy."

From 1147 to 1201, three Counts of Mountferrato took part in three Crusades to Jerusalem.

Is it not a striking fact that in the *Merchant of Venice,* the place phrases connect Belmont with two of the most ancient Feudal families of Italy and that no similar phrases relate to the Montefeltro, the Medici, the Sforza, the Colonna and the Orsini?

It is recognized by scholars that Shakespeare constantly idealized and portrayed the aristocracy of the Renaissance and that his knowledge of the English nobility was singularly accurate, though at times having some political bias.

Besides the brilliant example of Isabella d' Este as the ideal high born lady of Italy who died only fifty-nine years prior to the composition of the *Merchant of Venice,* there was living in Shakespeare's own time a distinguished and accomplished lady of the same family, Lucrezia d' Este, described by Ella Noyes as follows:—

> "She was a lady of the liveliest temperament, insatiate in her appetite for pleasure and excitement. She had fine talents and a vivacious wit, and had been very highly educated; in artistic and literary matters her taste was excellent, and she was a generous patron of poets and scholars. No learned man arrived in Ferrara, we are told, but she called him to her in order to hear him discourse and dispute with scholars. She it was, rather than Leonora, who protected the young Tasso in his first year at Ferrara."

Were these two the idealized prototypes of Shakespeare's Portia? Was Lucrezia d' Este ever, for any period, a resident in the Castle of Este built by her uncles, Ercole II and Cardinal Ippolito d' Este?

Belmont

(a) "If Shakespeare had ever been at Venice, which from the extraordinary keeping of the play, appears the most natural supposition, he must surely have had some situation in his eye for Belmont." (Charles Knight.)

(b) "Thus, she [Portia] is the heiress of a princely name and countless wealth; a train of obedient pleasures have ever waited round her; she treads as though her footsteps had been among marble palaces, beneath roofs of fretted gold, o'er cedar floors and pavements of jasper and porphyry, amid gardens full of haunting music. We will imagine Portia's standing on some lovely promontory, the Euganean hills for its background." (*Essays on Shakespeare's Characters,* Mrs. Anna Jameson.)

(c) "Her garden, . . . with terraces, arbours, statues, and straight paths sheltered with trees trained to grow in various shapes on arches of carpenter work." (*Merchant of Venice,* Evelyn Smith, 1926.)

But scholars are quite agreed that Shakespeare was never in Italy. The two tributes cited are only appreciative of Portia's aristocratic background and not for any location for Belmont. However such tributes may well represent scholarly opinion of that background as it appears in the text.

The Castle of Este.

A tourist in 1929, went south-west from Padua to Este and the auto registered 18.6 miles; near the Castle, the present auto road from Monselice to Este, a distance of some six miles, curves around the Euganean hills and may be shorter than the railroad which the *Encyclopedia Britannica* states is 20 miles from Padua to Este. The road in the 16th century may have been close to 20 miles.

Approximate measurements were taken as follows:—

1. The Park Gate and Avenue:
   (a) Width of avenue, 110 feet. Length, about 370 feet to the lawn circle, at foot of terraces.
   (b) Width of road in center of avenue, 20 feet; length, 370 feet; lined with some pillars and small statues.
   (c) Stone buildings, perhaps stables, in corner near Park Gate.
2. The Lawn Circle:
   (a) From 70 to 80 feet in diameter, sloping to avenue.
   (b) Grotto at foot of terraces, with pool of water.
3. The First Three Terraces:
   (a) On each side of the approach to the Castle, and with a road up each side.
   (b) Height of each, about ten feet.
4. The Fourth Terrace:
   (a) 27 feet wide and 75 feet long.
   (b) Height above third terrace, 12 feet.
5. The Fifth Terrace:
   (a) Below the level of the Castle, 15 feet.
   (b) Length along the front of the Castle, 125 feet.
   (c) Width front to back, about 55 feet; circular front. Lawns and shrubbery are now on these terraces.
6. The Castle:
   (a) Its center is in a straight line from the Castle through the entrance avenue.
   (b) The entire front wall is entirely gone; but the original length was 125 feet, the average length of the Castle about 110 feet, and from front to back about 105 feet.
   (c) The Donjon or Keep, 16 by 19 feet and about 50 feet high, was a central part of the Castle and is now standing intact.

(d) The massive rear wall of the Castle extends several hundred feet on each end of the Castle, and with its six symmetrical towers, forms an imposing picture from the Park Gate and the entrance avenue.

Hence from the Park Gate, it is some 60 feet above the entrance avenue and a direct distance to the Castle "Hall" of approximately 575 feet.

The Time, Place and Descriptive Phrases

1. The Tranect:

Portia commands Balthasar to come from Mantua

"Unto the tranect, to the common ferry
Which trades to Venice."

(a) In 1594, Fynes Moryson was in Padua and Venice and wrote:— "taking boat at the East gate of Padua, the same was drawne by horses along the River Brenta [a canal then and now]; & having shot two or three small bridges, and passed twenty miles, we came to the village Lizzafusina, where there is a damme to stop the water of Brenta. Here whiles our boat was drawne by an Instrument out of the River Brenta, into the Marshes of Venice. Then we entered our boate againe and passed five miles to Venice." (*An Itinerary,* Fynes Moryson, 1617.)

(b) Fourteen years later (1608), Thomas Coryat was in Padua and wrote that he "went away there hence in a Barke downe the river Brenta about Seven of the clocke in the morning, and came to Venice about two of the clocke in the afternoone. . . . river Brenta about Seven of the clocke in the afternoone . . . This Lucie Fesina . . . being five miles on this side Venice. There the fresh and salt water were kept asunder by a sluice that is made for the same purpose, over which sluice the Barkes that go forth and back betwixt Padua and Venice are lifted up by a certaine crane." (*Coryat's Crudities,* 1611.)

(c) In 1645, John Evelyn was in Venice and wrote in his *Diary*:— The first *terra firma* we landed at was Fusina, being only an inn, where we changed our barge, and were then drawne by horses through the river Brenta, a straight channel as even as a line for twenty miles."

And this canal "as even as a line" is still in operation in 1931.

2. Bassanio:

Nerissa. Do you not remember, lady, in your father's time, a Venetian, a scholar and a soldier, that came hither in company of the Marquis of Mountferrat?

Portia. Yes, yes, it was Bassanio;

When Coryat was in Padua in 1608, he took very unusual pains to describe, and gain entrance to the alleged house of Livy, the Roman historian, and stated in his *Crudities:*

"Now it is possessed by a certaine Gentleman called *Bassano* who at this time I was in Padua lived in a villa that he had in the country."

In 1645, John Evelyn was in the Grand Council Chamber in Venice and wrote of it:—

> "Over the Duke's throne are the paintings of the *Final Judgment,* by Tintoret, esteemed amongst the best pieces in Europe. On the roof are the famous Acts of the Republic, painted by several excellent masters, especially Bassano."

Giacomo da Ponte Bassano, born at Bassano in 1510, studied the works of Titian and Tintoretto in Venice. (*Hist. of Belvoir Castle,* Irvin Eller, 1841.)

About 1625, the Duke of Buckingham had in his great collection in London twenty-one paintings by Bassano. (*The Dukes of Buckingham,* Robert Coffin, 1931.)

It is of course, only an inference, that Ottonello Disculzio, professor of law in the University of Padua, noted for his eloquence and knowledge, and constantly consulted by the Senate and Council of Venice, was the prototype of Bellario. He was living in Shakespeare's time.

5. In 1574, the Duke of Mountferrato was created Duke of Mantua.

4. *Portia.* "There is a monastery, two miles off.

And there will we abide." (III. iv.)

The Marquis Azzo d' Este built the Convent of San Antonio for his daughter Beatrice, and her Aunt, Beatrice d' Este, founded a Convent in the Paduan hills.

It would indeed be interesting if investigation should disclose a Monastery, not a Convent, founded near Este by any member of that family, to give justification to the term Monastery and to the word "abide" by reason of its founding, as a suitable place for the lady of Belmont. Portia's most evident wit over her "whole device" does not at all agree with her words just spoken:

> I have toward heaven breathed a secret vow
> To live in prayer and contemplation,
> And there will we abide.

At the present time (1931) there is an old rambling Monastery about four miles from Este and near Monselice.

5. "By holy crosses:"

Stephano:

My mistress will before the break of day
Be here at Belmont: she doth stray about
By holy crosses, where she kneels and prays
For happy wedlock hours. (V. i.)

(a) Thomas Elze wrote that in the village of Saonara, about three miles S. W. of Stra and some 6 miles S. E. of Padua was the Benedictine Convent which in 1558 united with the nuns of the same Order at St. Anne's in Padua.

This was some four miles off the direct road from Venice to Padua.

(b) John Evelyn in Padua in 1645, wrote:—

"I went to see the convent of St. Justine, than which I never beheld one more magnificent." He states that it was planned by the famous architect Andrea Palladia (1518-80).

6. Portia at Belmont:

First go with me to church and call me wife,
And then away to Venice to your friend. (III. ii.)

The Church of San Martino in Este is at a distance of a five or six minutes' walk from the Park Gate. It is of great antiquity. Its modernized and beautiful Renaissance interior will command admiration.

7. Portia to Nerissa at Belmont:

But come, I'll tell thee all my whole device
When I am in my coach which stays for us
At the park gate; and therefore haste away,
For we must measure twenty miles to-day. (III. iv.)

The distance by auto from Este is now 18.6 miles, and by rail road 20 miles.

8. The original Quarto of the *Merchant of Venice* in 1600, the Quarto of 1619 (falsely dated 1600) and the First Folio of 1623 all printed *Mantua* as the place to which Portia sent Balthasar. The line was amended by Theobald nearly two hundred years ago and editors since have accepted his theory of verbal agreement with Padua in other lines, without Shakespeare's authority, with almost no evaluation of Portia's "whole device," her self-confessed collusion with Balthasar and Bellario, her most famous hoax on the Doge of Venice, and another hoax in connection with the exchange of the

rings. This is a thesis in itself, but it must be remembered that Shakespeare, while he was in London, had it printed *Mantua;* and this agrees exactly with the plan of linking the far-famed Houses of Este, Gonzaga and Mountferrat, and also agrees with no fewer than five time tags in her command to her attendant, Balthasar:

> *Portia.* Now Balthasar,
> As I have ever found thee *honest-true,*
> So let me find thee still. Take this same letter,
> And use thou all the *endeavour of a man*
> In *speed* to Mantua: see thou render this
> Into my cousin's hand, Doctor Bellario;
> And look, what notes and garments he doth give thee,
> Bring them, I pray thee, with *imagined speed,*
> Unto the tranect, to the common ferry
> Which trades to Venice. *Waste no time,* in words,
> But *get thee gone.* I shall be there before thee.

(The italics not in Quarto, etc.) (III. iv.)

The distance from Este to Mantua is 46 miles; hence, Balthasar (if Belmont was at Este) had to travel 92 miles to return to Este, then 20 miles to Padua, and 20 miles to the tranect, a distance of 132 miles; travelers then easily went 50 miles per day with relays. According to Eccles in 1805, and Daniel in 1879, the time requirement for the *Merchant of Venice* is 7 days.

These 5 "speed" phrases are meaningless if Portia and Balthasar traveled the same road.

9. The Return from the Trial to Belmont:

Duke. Sir I entreat you home with me to dinner.
Portia. I must away this night toward Padua.
And it is meet I presently set forth. (IV. i.)

In Act IV. i, the Duke refers to the trial "here to-day."

Bassanio. And in the morning early will we both Fly toward Belmont. (IV. i.)

By leaving Venice in the late afternoon or early evening, Portia could "stray about by holy crosses" at convents, but Bassanio, leaving "in the morning early," to travel 45 miles, would need to "fly toward Belmont."

10. The Arrival at Belmont:

Numerous phrases show this.

Portia. That light we see is burning in my hall.
How far that little candle throws his beams! (V. i.)

The distance from the Park Gate at the Castle of Este, through the

center of the entrance avenue, up some sixty feet through the center of the five terraces, to the center of the Castle where the hall would naturally be placed, was in a perfectly straight line, very close to 575 feet; and here, at the Park Gate, Portia could have accurately uttered these lines.

At more than twenty-five European castles and chateaux observed by the writer in 1927-9, no approach or entrance will correspond to the last quoted lines:

> Stephano had just said:
> My mistress will before the break of day
> Be here at Belmont:
> And Lancelot, of Bassanio:
> My master will be here ere morning.
> And Lorenzo:
> My friend Stephano, signify, I pray you,
> Within the house, your mistress is at hand;
> And bring your music forth into the air.
> And Lorenzo to Jessica:
> How sweet the moonlight sleeps upon this bank.

These lines also are applicable to a company of trained musicians, such as were then employed at Ferrara, and to the upper terrace at the Castle of Este.

11. Gradual approach of the dawn:

No fewer than eighteen phrases in Act V, i. disclose the advance of the very early morning at Belmont:

Lorenzo. The moon shines bright; in such a night as this, . . .

This idea is repeated nine times, seemingly to emphasize the time just before dawn.

Stephano. My mistress will before the break of day
Be here at Belmont.
Launcelot. My master will be here ere morning.
Lorenzo. How sweet the moonlight sleeps upon this bank!

. . .

Sit, Jessica: look, how the floor of heaven
Is thick inlaid with patines of bright gold;

"A *patine* (from Latin *patina*) is the small dish or plate used with the chalice in the administration of the Eucharist. It was commonly made of gold." (*Malone.*)

The context here suggests the gem in Shakespeare's Sonnet XXIX:—

> Like to the lark at break of day arising
> From sullen earth sings hymns at heaven's gate:

This can only mean that far above in the sky were visible small disks of clouds colored by the not yet risen sun, while the stars appear, as in the very next line:

There's not the smallest orb which thou behold'st
But in his motion like an angel sings.

Portia. This night, methinks, is but the daylight sick;
It looks a little paler: 'tis a day
Such as the day is when the sun is hid.

. . .

Portia. It is almost morning,
Let us go in.

. . .

Gratiano. Being two hours to day.

With such a beautiful scene represented on a level stage, critics and audiences may question its relevancy to the rest of the play; but with such exquisite lines, and its adequate portrayal on foreshortened terraces embellished with flowers, statuary, and medieval court costumes, Portia indeed might appear in her own ancestral background of splendor and culture.

(*Copyright by the author.*)

New Contributors in This Issue

ELMER EDGAR STOLL has been since 1915 Professor of English Literature at the University of Minnesota. He has published extensive studies of an independent, and often aggressive nature, relating to Shakespeare and the Elizabethan Drama. Among these are an elaborate criticism of *Othello,* a volume of *Shakespeare Studies,* and, most recently, *Poets and Playwrights.* Dr. Stoll is one of the vice-presidents of our Association.

WILLIAM KITTLE, for many years secretary of the State Board of Regents of Normal Schools in Wisconsin, has more recently been engaged in Europe on the study of sixteenth century literature. Since last year he has been engaged in the Library of Congress in the preparation of a series of monographs on the historical and political background of Shakespeare's plays. From his article it is evident that he has closely studied the setting of *The Merchant of Venice* at first hand.

Notes and Comment

In his notes on the movement of Shakespearean items, Dr. Smith sketches an illuminating picture of the influence of the general depression upon the sale of rare books. Perhaps some of us have given the matter little or no thought; some of us have doubtless wondered just what the effect might be. In any case the relation between economic conditions and the preservation, not to say the dissemination, of a nation's cultural heritage is being brought home to many of us, as never before in the memory of this generation.

In some respects culture is a flower of delicate growth; in others, it is a tough, hardy plant. And whether or not the sale of first editions is rapid or slow, Shakespeare thrives as vigorously as ever in the mind and heart of a troubled world, less troubled—far less than we can know —because he wrote the plays.

But if the book market is relatively stagnant, scholars and critics (trained and untrained) are as busy as ever in production, sale or no sale, for their commodities. (Most writing about Shakespeare is given freely to the world.) According to Dr. Tannenbaum's advance notices, the bibliography for the current year, to be published for the seventh time as our January issue, is larger than ever before. But we shall not even hint at overproduction.

Our contributing editor calls attention also to the appointment of Professor Joseph Q. Adams as director of research at the new Folger Library in Washington; and we gladly echo his estimate, "the best imaginable man for such a position." In its peculiar resources and opportunities, this institution will be unique in the whole world, and we shall expect notable results from Dr. Adams' guiding hand. We shall hope for frequent reports from him in these pages and also contributions of his own research. As a vice-president of our Association and a devoted supporter of our efforts, he will, we trust, bring us into close relations with the progress of this great memorial.

The spirit of the Stratford Festival Company must inspire admiration and gratitude in all Americans interested in Shakespeare. For the third time they bring to us their productions, as they cross the continent. We are confident that the present external conditions will not affect the size, much less the enthusiasm of their audiences. Indeed we should expect both to increase. For the company has become almost an American institution. We know that every member of the Association will be glad to help in any way toward the success of the tour.

A Correction

From Dr. Robert Weston Babcock, author of the article on Saint's Oaths in the July issue, comes this reminder:

On page 99, in the fifth paragraph,

the article says:

"My contention is, therefore that this line should read as follows, as it is printed in the Folio, 'Go, by, St. Jeronimy, go to thy cold bed, and warm thee,' the only change from the Folio being the insertion of a 't' after the 'S' to make the orthodox abbreviation of 'saint.' "

The comma after "Go by" and before "St. Jeronimy," I had purposely omitted in my manuscript, and it does not appear in the Folio. The omission of the comma makes the sentence into a direct command to the Hostess and adds a touch of ribald humor that is in accord with what I believe was Shakespeare's usage in saints' oaths.

Shakespeare's Death Held Due to Thirteen Diseases

The death, in 1616, of William Shakespeare, fifty-two years old, bard, was due to a complication of thirteen diseases, according to an article in "The Lancet," British medical weekly, by Dr. MacLeod Yearsley, consulting surgeon to St. James' Hospital.

According to Dr. Yearsley, the famous playwright's death resulted from a complication of fever, typhus, typhoid, paralysis, epilepsy, apoplexy, arterio-sclerosis, over-smoking, chronic alcoholism, gluttony, angina pectoris, Bright's disease, pulmonary congestion and locomotor ataxia.

SHAKESPEARE'S PROPHETIC VISION

A correspondent sends in to the London *Observer* the following evidence of the fact that Shakespeare knew all about motor cars.

"Whence is that knocking?" (*Macbeth,* II, 1)

"Will this gear ne'er be mended?" (*Troilus and Cressida,* I, 1)

"I will remedy this gear 'ere long." (2 *Henry VI,* III, 1)

"Thou hast worn out thy pump." (*Romeo and Juliet,* II, 4)

"How the wheel becomes it!" (*Hamlet,* IV, 5)

"Come, let me clutch thee!" (*Macbeth,* II, 1)

"And here an engine fit for my proceeding." (*Two Gentlemen of Verona,* III, 1)

"You should see how I handle her." (*Measure for Measure,* V, 1)

"To climb steep hills requires slow pace at first." (*Henry VIII,* I, 1)

"O most wicked speed!" (*Hamlet,* I, 2)

"This lapwing runs away with the shell!" (*Hamlet,* V, 2)

"How dost thou know that constable?" (*Measure for Measure,* II, 1)

*"Give me Swift for transportation." (*Troilus and Cressida,* III, 2)

*(This quotation is not correct. It should read:
"Give me Swift transportance to those fields.")

"Which of you know Ford of this town?" (*Merry Wives of Windsor,* I, 3)

A Correction and Some Additions

In my short paper, "A Neglected Shakspere Document" (in the July issue of this BULLETIN, page 111), I made the statement that "no biographer of the poet" has a word to say about a certain bail-bond discovered by Halliwell-Phillipps. I should have said "no biographer of the poet, with the notable exception of Professor Joseph Quincy Adams."

In Dr. Adams's *A Life of William Shakespeare* (ed. 1923) this bond is mentioned in the footnote on page 32.

Those who were interested in Dr. Holzknecht's list of "recent book titles from Shakespeare" will undoubtedly want to add the following items to the collection:

Strange Bedfellows, by Andrew Soutar (quotation from *The Tempest,* II. ii, 42);

Yellow Sands, by Eden Phillpotts (from *The Tempest,* I. ii, 376);

Her Privates We (also published as *The Middle Parts of Fortune*), by Frederic Manning (from *Hamlet,* II. ii, 238);

Naked and Alone, by D. Hill (from *Hamlet* IV. vii, 52);

The Name of Action, by G. Greene from *Hamlet,* III. i, 88);

Good Night, Ladies!, by Marie Van *Vorst* (from *Hamlet,* IV. v, 72);

This Above All, by M. P. Shiel (from *Hamlet,* I. iii, 78);

Uncertain Glory, by Margaret Yeo (from *Two Gentlemen of Verona,* I. iii, 85);

The Blanket of the Dark, by John Buchan (from *Macbeth,* I. v, 54);

Told by an Idiot, by Rose Macauley (from *Macbeth,* V. v, 27);

Vaulting Ambition, by Ellis Middleton (from *Macbeth,* I. vii, 27);

The Third Murderer, by Carroll J. Day (from *Macbeth,* III. iii);

The Imperial Theme, by G. W. Knight (from *Macbeth,* I. iii, 129);

The Month of May, by Jane Dashwood (from *1 Henry IV,* IV. 1);

The Winds of March, by H. Sutcliffe (from *The Winter's Tale,* IV. iv, 120);

Two and Twenty, by Cecil S. Forester (from *The Winter's Tale,* III, iii, 65);

The Wheel of Fire, by G. W. Knight (from *King Lear,* IV. vii, 47);

Weep No More, by Ward Greene (from *King Lear,* III. iv, 17);

Full Circle, by Elinor Mordaunt (from *King Lear,* V. iii, 174);

World-Without-End, by Helen Thomas (from *Love's Labor's Lost,* V. ii, 787);

The Noblest Roman of them All, by H. G. Layer (from *Julius Caesar,* V. v, 68);

In the Dark, by Elias Tobenkin (from *Othello,* V. i, 63);

The Walls are High, by J. Van Raalte (from *Romeo and Juliet,* II. ii, 63);

The Skirts of the Forest, by Violet Quirk (from *As You Like It,* III. ii, 354);

Are We All Met?, by Whitford Kane (from *Midsummer Night's Dream,* II. i, 1);

Strong Poison, by D. L. Sayers (from *2 Henry VI,* III. iii, 18);

The Master-Mistress, by Rose O'Neill (from *Sonnet 20*).

SAMUEL A. TANNENBAUM.

Notes on Shakespeareana

By ROBERT M. SMITH

The fall, winter, spring and summer of 1930-31 have passed with little to disturb the stagnation that has fallen upon transactions in Shakespeareana, as well as upon trade as a whole. Book dealers have been sitting as calmly as possible, their shelves stocked with rare volumes purchased at the height of the boom in the Kern sale, and waiting for prosperity to return. In spite of the general depression, the auction houses have had a fairly good year. As books of genuine rarity and value do not suffer from the ills of overproduction, their prices are correspondingly maintained. Large reductions have been made, however, in prices of modern first editions, a class of books that suffered greatly from inflation. In the spring accordingly came interesting declarations of opposite policies by two well known dealers, Messrs. Elkin Mathews Ltd. of London, and The Rosenbach Company of New York and Philadelphia. The London company, which deals largely in modern Firsts, after reviewing the situation, concluded that book prices should give way with prices in general, and issued a catalogue with a complete revaluation of their offerings. To this announcement The Rosenbach Company, which specializes in fine items, responded with a manifesto, *To Those of Little Faith* (Publishers' Weekly, May 2, 1931):

> "The action of certain book-sellers, in surrendering to hard times, by halving their prices, or accepting 'reasonable offers,' is either a confession that they charged too much in the past, or have no faith in the wares they offer. We will not deviate from the prices marked on each item. We have unalterable faith in the books and manuscripts we sell, believing them far above the vagaries of the stock-market.
>
> "A First Folio of Shakespeare has a value for all time. The prices of the great books of the world have not been inflated, while many of uncertain value, still unjudged by time and often of questionable rarity, have been forced up to excessive prices. The latter are still high, despite the so-called reductions.
>
> "We shall stick by our guns, believing fully in the items we offer, and we shall continue to supply our customers and friends with books of real value, instead of the things that have been boomed as 'good buys.' "

Activity has been most noticeable, however, not in Elizabethan literature, but in American First Editions, the values of which are rapidly increasing. This is a field in which the tyro and the moderately well-to-do may still participate. But there are sighs for the robust collectors of a few years ago. With the passing of Huntington, White, and Folger, the intense competition for Elizabethan books has disappeared. No longer can a dealer purchase abroad a First Folio at any price with the anticipation of selling it eventually to Mr. Folger. On the contrary, he is now likely to have the volume on his hands for an extended period.

Perhaps the most notable event is the issue within the last six months of four extraordinary catalogues by The Rosenbach Company. They reveal what has been only generally and imperfectly known heretofore—that Dr. Rosenbach with his combination of acumen, learning, and taste, whether as book lover, bibliographer, or book-seller, has formed a collection which for rarity and unique interest has probably never been surpassed in the history of the trade. First came *Monuments of Printing 1455-1500;* second, *Illuminated Manuscripts, Authors' Manuscripts and Rare Books;* then, *Memorable Documents in American History from Columbus to Hoover;* and finally a valuable check list of *English Books, 1475-1640.* The *Foreword* to this list reads like a roll call with the rarest literary monuments answering, "Present". Among twenty-six of the finest English incunabula are thirteen from Caxton's press, including the *Canterbury Tales* (1484) and the *Confessio Amantis* (1483). A particular treasure, destined always to be the envy of Elizabethan collectors, is Edmund Spenser's own copy of the *Faerie Queene* presented by him to Elizabeth Boyle, his future wife, with the first sonnet of the *Amoretti* written by him on a blank page. The collection is particularly rich in minor Elizabethan writers, Churchyard, Chettle, Breton, Watson, Barnes, Massinger, Southwell, Rowlands, and Taylor. Daniel, Drayton, and Greene are fully represented in excessively rare and precious editions; Heywood by twenty-three items and Bacon by seventeen. Of the Shakespare rarities the Foreword repeats in general what I noted more particularly in the Shakespeare Association Bulletin for July, 1929.

> "Shakespeare and his period are represented by a gathering of folios and quartos that can never again be equalled. Plays, prose and poetry, books containing allusions to Shakespeare and the 'apparatus' that surrounds his magic name—these will be found in profusion. To form another similar collection would now be im-

possible, since the only duplicates of many of these items are permanently installed in the great libraries of the world. Indeed, with the removal of Mr. W. A. White's fine collection to Harvard College and Mr. H. C. Folger's priceless gathering to Washington, no such array of Shakespeare quartos exists in any private library in England or America."

Dr. Rosenbach's catalogues are not priced, though the books listed are for sale. The check list will fill a need long felt by scholars, librarians, and bibliographers. Professor Pollard will specially welcome it in preparing the revised edition of the *Short Title Catalogue,* for there are many unrecorded items in Dr. Rosenbach's collection.

British booksellers with Shakespeare Folios to offer have not abated marking up prices. In October, 1930, Charles J. Sawyer issued an attractive catalogue (No. 100) on the twenty-fifth birthday of his business. Herein he lists a Second Folio with title and leaf of verses in facsimile for £650—a large price for a defective copy, when there are so many available. In December, Bernard Quaritch's catalogue (No. 436) listed a copy of the First Folio, unrecorded by Lee, for £18,000. This copy also is defective, the leaf of verses is inlaid and a portion of the title is in facsimile. No such price was ever before demanded for a First Folio with these defects, yet $100,000 is a sum now frequently mentioned as the value of a good copy. The Boston Public Library recently gave this value to their Thomas Barton copy, though it is not one of the finest. Evidently dealers are biding their time and counting upon the dearth of First Folios caused by Mr. Folger's extraordinary appetite for 79 (counting fragments).

An account of the Folger collection, now being assembled in Washington, and a vision of what it should become, may be found in an essay by Professor George Frisbie Whicher of Amherst College in the *Atlantic Monthly* for June, 1931. A complementary essay from the pen of Dr. Rosenbach, who played no small part in this enterprise, entitled *Henry C. Folger As a Collector,* gives for the first time a dramatic account of Mr. Folger's life-long progress in forming the collection. The Trustees of Amherst College have appointed as Librarian of the Folger library, Mr. Andrew W. Slade, whose experience as Chief Bibliographer of the Library of Congress is a guarantee that the institution will be capably managed, and as Director of Research, one of our Vice Presidents, Professor Joseph Q. Adams, who, we will certainly agree, is the best imaginable man for such a position.

A Shakespeare "Spell-Down" in Ohio

In lieu of the Club Forum for this number Mrs. Robert Carlton Morris sends the following account of a novel Shakespearean performance:

On Shakespeare Day at Lakeside, July 7, the Ohio Shakespeare Society conducted an old-fashioned "spell-down." A very large audience applauded the participants in a very exciting contest. The three winners who answered all the questions in the enclosed list, and many other additional questions which I was obliged to invent, were Miss Mary Hartman, who has just received her M.A. from Smith College, Miss Nan Betty Jackson, just graduated from Scott High School, Toledo, and Mrs. Harrison J. Mautz of Marion, Ohio. Hundreds of people were interested in the questions, which had been posted throughout the state in public libraries.

The following are some of the questions:

What was the name of Shakespeare's mother? Of Shakespeare's father?

Describe the London of Shakespeare's period, giving six facts concerning the city.

Describe Stratford-upon-Avon in middle of 16th century (not more than 300 words).

Brief resumè of reign of Queen Elizabeth.

Name ten famous contemporaries of Shakespeare.

Describe the theatres of the period (300 words or less).

What is the First Folio?

What first folios are now in the U. S.?

What building, of great interest to Shakespeare students, is now being erected in Washington?

Name two actors of Shakespeare's period.

Name five great actresses who played in Shakespearean roles in 19th century in any country.

Name five great actresses who interpreted Shakespearean characters previous to 19th century.

Brief biographical sketches of David Garrick, Thomas Betterton, Edmund Kean, Edwin Booth, Henry Irving, Richard Burbage.

Name five great painters who were inspired by Shakespeare's scenes and characters.

Name five great musicians who turned one or more plays into operas.

Name certain Shakespearean lyrics which have inspired musicians.

Name Shakespeare's poems, tragedies, comedies, Roman plays, English historical plays.

Name his earliest plays (5).

What play was his last work?

In what play is the character Polonius, Iago, Prospero, Shallow, Hotspur, Benedick, Puck, Dogberry, Bottom, Rosalind, Orsino, Petruchio, Malvolio, Perdita, Constance, Prince Hal, Mistress Quickly, Volumnia, Brutus, Mercutio, Banquo, Horatio, Imogen, Cordelia?

Name a London tavern of the period.

Name Cleopatra's maids.

Name two women characters who were friends.

Name two men characters who were friends.

What character said, "There is nothing either good or bad, but thinking makes it so?"

Who said "None can be called deformed but the unkind"?

Who said "Study is like the heaven's glorious sun"?

Who said "Let us not burden our remembrances with a heaviness that's gone"?

Who said "What infinite heart's ease

Must kings neglect, that private men enjoy?"

Repeat the 116th Sonnet.

Repeat a passage from a tragedy, from *As You Like It,* from *The Tempest,*

Name ten flowers mentioned by Shakespeare.

In what city or country is the setting of *Hamlet, Othello, Romeo and Juliet, King Lear, The Winter's Tale?*

Which is your favorite play and why?

Which is your favorite character, and why?

What is the secret of Shakespeare's power as a writer?

How has Shakespeare expressed his feeling about slander, about sleep, about selfish ambition, about old age, about courage, about music?

Name Shakespeare's children.

As a traveler, what associations with Shakespeare will you find in London? Scotland? Rome? Verona? Venice? France? Denmark?

Give the titles of several books which were inspired by Shakespeare.

Reviews and Discussions

Shallow vs. Hotson*

It is with no inconsiderable regret that I have to report that Professor Leslie Hotson's "sensational" discovery has left me quite cold. Professor Hotson's trepidation and excitement have not communicated themselves to me, even though I can appreciate the thrills he got when he saw the precious name of "Willelm Shakspere" on a hitherto unknown legal document (a writ to keep the peace), or when his trembling hand received the old silver communion cup which William Gardiner, Esquire, bequeathed by will to his parish church. But I, for one, would have preferred to learn something new about the personality of the creator of Hamlet, Othello, King Lear, Imogen, Hermione, and Cleopatra, rather than to have learned that for a few months Shakspere's company probably played in the new Swan Theatre, that the poet himself probably resided on the Bankside in or about November 1596, and that he was named—with several others—in the aforesaid writ. Unfortunately Shakspere's name does not reappear in the story. The gentle Shakspere proves as elusive as ever.

Professor Hotson has a perfect right, of course, to make as much of his "great discovery" as he can. But he has no right to say that Shakspere has been "hitherto known only as a poet and player, affable, and unobtrusive." We know quite a good deal about him as a son, as a husband, as a father, as a lover, as an Englishman, as a citizen, as a thinker, as a business man, as a neighbor, and so forth.

William Gardiner was a justice of the peace, in 1596 he persecuted the owner of the newly built Swan Theatre, got into a quarrel with a company of actors one of whom was William Shakspere, and had married a woman named Frances Luce or Lucy. Recalling that in *The Merry Wives of Windsor* Shakspere makes some punning and uncomplimentary references to the "white luces, or heraldic fishes, blazoned in Justice Shallow's coat of arms," Professor Hotson jumped to the conclusion that Justice Shallow is a caricature of Justice Gardiner. To confirm this he examined Gardiner's heraldic achievements, and found that by marrying the daughter of Robert "Luce or Lucy" Gardiner was entitled to quarter with his arms (a golden griffin) the three white luces of the Lucy family. This settled the matter for Professor Hotson, especially as he also found that Gardiner had owned a park with a gate-house, and had been fined in his youth for drawing blood in a fight, and had 'suggested' the marriage of his stepson, William Wayte, to one Joan Tayler, a young heiress. To comprehend the significance of these facts, the reader should bear in mind that Justice Shallow "owns a park with a keeper's lodge," "boasts of his youthful prowess with the sword," and "endeavors to marry his nephew Slender to a young heiress."

Inasmuch as Gardiner's writ was issued in November 1596 and he died on November 26, 1597, Professor Hotson thinks Shakspere must have written the play in which he caricatures the Justice and his weak and subservient stepson between these dates. Presumably, Will Shakspere would not have lampooned a dead man.

Going still further, Professor Hotson narrows the date of the play's composition down to the second and third weeks in April 1597. To do this he takes advantage of the known fact that in the early version of *The Merry Wives* (printed in 1602) there is a reference to "cosen garmombles" (usually and, no doubt, rightly, regarded as a pun on the name of the Count of Mömpelgart) and to the more or less generally held assumption that this play was written for some Feast of the Order of the Garter (usually celebrated on St. George's Day, *i.e.*, April 23). He points out that Frederick, Duke of Württemberg (the former Count of Mömpelgart) was named a Knight of the Garter by Queen Elizabeth on April 23, 1597, though the Count was not in

* "A Great Discovery," in *Atlantic Monthly*, 148:419-436, October, 1931. *Shakespeare versus Shallow*, by L. Hotson; Boston, Little Brown & Co., pp. xiv, 375, illust., $4.

England at the time — a fact at which Shakspere seems to make a sly hit in the words he puts into the mouth of the French Doctor Caius (in the fifth scene of the fourth act): "You make grant preparation for a duke de Jarmany: by my trot, dere is no duke, dat de court is know to come." Professor Hotson therefore concludes that *Merry Wives* was written for this particular Feast of the Garter at the request of Queen Elizabeth, a request which may have been transmitted to the poet by Lord Hunsdon, then master of Shakspere's company, who was also knighted that April 23d.

Unfortunately this pretty patchwork will not stand up under close examination. The ridiculing of the German Duke would not have been permitted by Queen Elizabeth if she had deliberately played a trick on him by having him elected to the Order in his absence and without informing him of the fact, thus putting off to some future time the expense of sending him the insignia. The Duke would have resented such an insult. Furthermore, Dr. Caius's remark about "preparation for a duke de Jarmany" indicates that the count *was* expected to be present at the Garter Feast.

Considering Mömpelgart's repeated efforts after 1597 to get his insignia and his final investiture with them in November 1603, Shakspere's allusion to the subject would have been understood and timely at any time between 1597 and the end of 1603, or even a little later. From the fact that *Merry Wives* borrows a line ("What is the reason that you use me thus?") from *Hamlet*, it is all but certain that *The Merry Wives* is later than this play and must have been written or revised after 1600.

Justice Shallow is not Justice Gardiner. The latter was, it may be granted, a quarrelsome rogue, a rascal, a knave, and cheat—a thoroughly unlovable person. Shallow is garrulous but not unlovable; in fact, Shakspere makes him quite a sympathetic figure and we feel that he has been wronged by Falstaff. Professor Hotson, undoubtedly aware of this objection to his inferences, would have us think that Shakspere 'wisely' converted the knave into a fool on the theory that "to beknave him [Gardiner] was to compliment him." This, to me, seems much more than merely improbable. How was the audience to recognize in the "imbecile" Shallow the subtle knave, Justice Gardiner? Satire is not written that way.

Professor Hotson evidently thinks that the allusion to the white luces would make the identification. But this is the weakest spot in his case. What part of Shakspere's audience could possibly know that Gardiner's wife's coat of arms contained white luces? Shakspere himself probably did not know that fact. And who can or will believe that Shakspere was the kind of man who would have revenged himself on one who had "put him to trouble and expense at law" by making a disgusting reference to the arms of a woman, and a woman who had been dead for many years? Only a cad would have done that; Shakspere was no cad. Be it borne in mind, too, that Professor Hotson has not supplied Shakspere with a sufficient motive for caricaturing Gardiner.

Between Shakspere's inimitable Slender and Gardiner's weak stepson there is not the slightest resemblance.

It should also be noted that Francis Meres does not mention *Merry Wives* in his *Palladis Tamia* (1598). Had this play been written by the Queen's order for such a notable occasion as the Feast of the Garter in 1597, Meres would undoubtedly have heard of it and included it among Shakspere's comedies.

It is evident, therefore,—'t is true 't is pity, and pity 't is 't is true,—that Mr. Hotson has added nothing of any consequence to our knowledge of the god of our idolatry. S.A.T.

(*Reprinted, with alterations and additions, from the New York Times, Oct. 18, 1931.*)